UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772.347	01/29/2001	Jennifer Pearson	003801.P038	2384

8791 7590 11/03/2004		EXAMINER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN		HOFFMAN, BRANDON S
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD		
SEVENTH FLOOR		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/772,347	PEARSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 January 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
            application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- On page 4, line 16, a reference to figure 6 should appear.

    Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to because figure 6 is missing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Nazem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227).

        Regarding claims 1, 20, 22, and 24, Nazem et al. teaches a

method/system/computer readable medium for maintaining login preference information

of users of a network-based transaction facility, the method comprising:

- Communicating user interface information to a client via a communications

    network, the user interface information including information concerning a

    plurality of features within the network-based transaction facility and specifying a

    login interface facilitating user input of login preference information pertaining to

    each of the plurality of features (col. 5, lines 43-49);

- Receiving the login preference information from the client via the

    communications network (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line 2); and

- Utilizing the login preference information to control user access to any of the

    plurality of features within the network-based transaction facility via the

    communications network (fig. 2, ref. num 218).

Regarding claim 3, Nazem et al. teaches comprising storing the login preference

information in a database (fig. 1, ref. num 116).

Regarding claim 4, Nazem et al. teaches further comprising:

- Initiating a user session upon receiving user login information (col. 3, lines 15-

  21);

- Retrieving the login preference information from the database using the user

  login information (fig. 1, ref. num 116);

- Storing the login preference information in a session cookie during the user

  session (col. 3, lines 15-21);

- Receiving a user request to access a selected feature of the plurality of features

  within the network-based transaction facility (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line 2);

  and

- Utilizing the login preference information in the session cookie when determining

  whether to require the user to enter user access information before providing

  user access to the selected feature (fig. 2, ref. num 218).

Regarding claim 6, Nazem et al. teaches further comprising:

- Receiving a user request not to use a cookie during user online activity within the

  network-based transaction facility (this feature can be set in the browser settings

  as is well known); and

- Retrieving the login preference information from the database when determining whether to require the user to enter user login information before providing user access to a selected feature of the plurality of features within the network-based transaction facility (fig. 1, ref. num 116 and col. 3, lines 15-21).

Regarding claim 7, Nazem et al. teaches further comprising:

- Presenting a user interface allowing the user to change the login preference information (fig. 5A, ref. num 508); and

- Updating the login preference information in a database (col. 3, lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 8, Nazem et al. teaches further comprising: -

- Receiving user login information (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line 2);

- Determining that the user has previously provided the login preference information (col. 3, lines 15-21); and

- Presenting a welcome user interface including user interface information indicating that the user has previously provided the login preference information (fig. 3).

Regarding claims 12, 21, 23, and 25, Nazem et al. teaches a method/system/computer readable medium to control access to a network-based transaction facility, the method including:

- Identifying a user associated with a network session to access the network-based transaction (col. 3, lines 15-21);

- Identifying stored access preferences associated with the user, the stored access preferences indicating access requirements to each of a plurality of features provided by the network-based transaction facility (fig. 1, ref. num 116); and

- Controlling access to each of the plurality of features in accordance with the stored access preferences (col. 5, lines 50-64).

Regarding claim 13, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the controlling comprises implementing different access restrictions to respective features of the plurality of features according to the stored access preferences (col. 5, lines 50-64).

Regarding claim 14, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the controlling requires selectively requiring user identity verification information to access a first feature of the plurality of features in accordance with the stored access preferences (col. 11, top section of code requires a login, from thereon, a cookie is used to store the login information).

Regarding claim 15, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the user identity verification information comprises a password (it is inherent that a password is used along with the login name.).

Regarding claim 16, Nazem et al. teaches including communicating a request to the user to determine a set of access preferences pertaining to the plurality of features, and storing a response to the request as the stored access preferences (col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 12).

Regarding claim 17, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the request comprises a user interface via which the user composes the response (fig. 5A, ref. num 508).

Regarding claim 18, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the user interface comprises a markup language document (col. 2, lines 44-48).

Regarding claim 19, Nazem et al. teaches wherein the plurality of features includes any one of a group comprising sell, bid, chat, feedback, account information, personalization, tracking and financial features (fig. 5A and 5B, stock quotes, personalized weather, etc.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 2, 5, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nazem et al. (USPN '227) in view of My Yahoo (Wayback Machine

1998-12-12).

Regarding claim 2, Nazem et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1, above.

However, Nazem et al. does not teach wherein the login preference information

indicates whether a user password should be remembered for each of the plurality of

features.

My Yahoo teaches wherein the login preference information indicates whether a

user password should be remembered for each of the plurality of features (page 1, left

side, checkbox for 'Remember my ID & Password').

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine an option for remembering the login preferences for

each of the plurality of feature, as taught by My Yahoo, with the method of Nazem et al.

It would have been obvious for such modifications because this saves the user time

from logging in each time they access the page, especially when the user has a home

machine that no one else uses.

Regarding claim 5, Nazem et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 3, and 4, above. However, Nazem et al. does not teach wherein the login preference information is stored in the session cookie in a secured manner.

My Yahoo teaches wherein the login preference information is stored in the session cookie in a secured manner (page 3, 'Secure').

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the login preference information is stored in a secured manner, as taught by My Yahoo, with the method of Nazem et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the preference information contains sensitive data, which would be desirable to be kept secret and secure.

Regarding claim 9, Nazem et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1, above. However, Nazem et al. does not teach including always requiring a user password for any feature involving display of user personal information.

My Yahoo teaches including always requiring a user password for any feature involving display of user personal information (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine always requiring a password for displaying personal

information, as taught by My Yahoo, with the method of Nazem et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications in the case that remember my password was previously checked, and a usurper were to gain access to the computer, the usurper would be able to gain access to the personal information. By making a password required, this prevents the problem.

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Nazem et al. in view of My Yahoo teaches wherein the user personal information includes any one of a group comprising credit card information and registration information (see col. 6, lines 23-26 of Nazem et al.).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem et al. (USPN '227) in view of Godin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,138).

Regarding claim 11, Nazem et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1, above. However, Nazem et al. does not teach wherein the network-based transaction facility is a network-based auction facility.

Godin et al. teaches wherein the network-based transaction facility is a network-based auction facility (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine an auction facility, as taught by Godin et al., with the

method of Nazem et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because an

auction allows user to bid on products at their own convenience from home.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 703-305-

4662. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00. However, my new

office number will be 571-272-3863 after our October move.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BH

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100